

# **CHAPTER 7**

## **TEST ADMINISTRATION**

### **DETERMINING STUDENTS FOR WHOM A SCHOOL IS ACCOUNTABLE**

Beginning with the 1993-94 school year, schools were held accountable for open-response test scores of all students enrolled in the school on the first day of the on-demand testing window (see Table 7-1). In that same year, schools were held accountable for a student's Writing Portfolio score if the student was enrolled in the school on the day Writing Portfolios were due, as long as that student had been enrolled in any Kentucky public school for at least 100 days. Any student for whom a school was accountable, but who was not tested or did not produce a portfolio, was assigned a score of *Novice*. Legislation placed the Mathematics Portfolio into a research and development phase, and it did not count in the assessment for Accountability Cycle 3. After use as an instructional tool on a voluntary basis, during the 1997-98 school year, the Mathematics Portfolio was removed from the assessment program and placed in a status of voluntary resource for instructional enrichment. For Performance Events, schools were held accountable for students attending school on the day of testing; this policy did not change across the initial four years of KIRIS testing. Following the 1996 assessment, however, equating difficulties led to the placement of the Performance Events in a research and development status. Performance Events were not in the accountability index calculations for Accountability Cycle 3. Beginning with 1997, a national Norm Referenced Test (NRT) was administered at grades 3, 6 and 9 during the same testing window. The NRT selected was the Reading and Mathematics survey editions of the CTBS/5 TerraNova. The NRT was not part of the accountability index during Accountability Cycle 3.

| <b>TABLE 7-1</b><br><b>RULES FOR DETERMINING STUDENTS FOR WHOM A SCHOOL IS ACCOUNTABLE</b> |   |   |
|--|---|---|
| Accountability Year  | On-Demand Eligibility   | Portfolio Eligibility   |
| 1993   | Enrolled on 20th day of school year   | Same as on-demand   |
| 1994   | Grades 4 and 8 - Enrolled on April 18, 1994<br>Grade 12 - Enrolled on February 7, 1994  | Enrolled on March 1, 1994, and enrolled in one or more Kentucky public schools for at least 100 days by March 1. The 100 day regulation applies to all following years. |
| 1995   | Grade 7/8 - Enrolled on April 17, 1995<br>Grade 11/12 - Enrolled on February 6, 1995    | Enrolled on March 24, 1995<br>Mathematics Portfolio – Enrolled on March 17, 1995. The Mathematics Portfolio was applied to accountability in Cycle 2 but not Cycle 3.   |
| 1996   | Grades 4 and 8 - Enrolled on April 15, 1996<br>Grade 11 - Enrolled on February 12, 1996 | Enrolled on March 22, 1996<br>The Mathematics Portfolio was discontinued after this year.   |
| 1997   | Grades 4/5, 7/8 and 11 - Enrolled on April 14, 1997                                     | Enrolled on March 28, 1997  |
| 1998   | Grades 4/5, 7/8 and 11 – Enrolled on April 22, 1998                                     | Enrolled on March 27, 1998  |

**COLLECTING ENROLLMENT INFORMATION.** Student enrollment information was taken from information provided by students and teachers on the scannable student response booklets, each of which had a lithocode tracking number. The writing portfolio score form also had the same lithocode tracking number that was assigned to the student once these forms were completed and scanned by the contractor.

The scoring contractor verified the enrollment information in two ways for the on-demand assessment. The first was by comparing the scanned information to a "student accountability roster" that each school is required to send to the contractor. The roster contained the names of all students enrolled on the on-demand assessment date of accountability. Crosschecking this information against the data on the school's Principal Certification of Proper Test Administration form (Appendix B) was the second. This form documented the number of students enrolled in the school (on the date of accountability), how many were tested, how many were exempted (in accordance with KDE exemption guidelines), and how many were not tested (in accordance with KDE guidelines).

For the Writing Portfolio assessment, schools returned a Writing Portfolio score form (with the same lithocode as the student response booklet) for all students enrolled on the portfolio date of accountability. After teachers scored the portfolios, the score form was mailed with the student response booklet to the scoring contractor. If a student was still enrolled on the on-demand date of accountability there was no issue with student enrollment, but if the student moved between the portfolio date of accountability and the on-demand date of accountability, the school and student had an enrollment discrepancy. To account for this discrepancy the Principal's Certification of Proper Test Administration form had a column for schools to account for students who moved between these dates. The scoring contractor then compared the portfolio file, on-demand file, and Principal's Certification of Proper Test Administration form to ensure the school accounted for the student. This same process worked in reverse for students who moved into a school between the accountability dates. Schools still completed a writing portfolio score form for the student but marked the form as moving into the school after the portfolio date of accountability.

**EXEMPTIONS.** KDE authorized the following exemptions for the on-demand assessment.

- A student eligible for language exemption according to Department of Education policy: students whose native language was not English and who had been enrolled in an English-speaking school for fewer than two years were exempt from testing.
- A foreign exchange student was exempt.
- A student with an identified disability who was eligible for an Alternate Portfolio according to criteria established by the Department of Education: students in this category were exempt from on-demand testing and the Writing Portfolio. These students each developed an Alternate Portfolio, which counted toward their school accountability index in the same manner as students taking the on-demand assessment. Criteria for eligible students are detailed in the *Program Advisory 92-OCAA-104 (February, 1993)* and published annually in the *Kentucky Alternate Portfolio Teacher's Guide* and the *District Assessment Coordinator Implementation Guidebook*.
- A student could be exempted from testing for medical reasons if a signed doctor's statement was provided.

The same exemptions were authorized for the Writing Portfolio assessment along with the addition of the 100 day rule. Students needed to be enrolled in a Kentucky public school (including treatment or detention centers, or home/hospital instruction) for at least 100 instructional days prior to the portfolio completion date to be included for accountability (out-of-state, home, Department of Defense, and private schools were not considered Kentucky public schools). The term "instructional days" applied to those days that the school was in session and that students were scheduled for class work, thereby excluding professional development days, holidays, snow days, and weekends.

Absences, suspensions, and expulsions were not reasons to adjust an individual student's number of instructional days.

**MODIFICATIONS TO DATA FILES.** If conflicts in data were noted during scanning or enrollment verification, District Assessment Coordinators were notified to assist in the resolution of the conflict. If the data discrepancy was not able to be resolved at the district level the information was forwarded to KDE for resolution. Confirmed data changes were made to the master student data files by the assessment contractor. Final rosters listing the names and scores of students included in accountability calculations accompanied the schools' accountability reports.

Students who were not exempt but did not attempt the On-Demand Writing test or Writing Portfolio were assigned to the Novice performance level in the accountability reports. The percentage of Kentucky's fourth and fifth graders assigned to Novice because they did not complete the tests was stable over the course of the third accountability cycle. Seventh and eighth graders assigned Novice increased somewhat during Cycle 3, and no conclusions can be drawn about eleventh and twelfth graders because of changes in counting procedures. Tables 7-2 through 7-4 show for grades 4/5, 7/8, and 11/12, respectively, the number of students classified as exempt from on-demand testing, the number classified as Novice because they did not attempt the tests, and the number who completed the On-Demand Writing tests.

The exempted 'other' category includes students who moved out of state (or to private schools) and were unavailable for testing. Due to differences in record keeping across the years, a small number of additional students are included in the 'other' category in order to simplify the tables. Eligible students are noted above as 'not tested (novice)' in cases where no attempt was made at any open-response question, or all open-response questions were given off topic responses.

**TABLE 7-2**  
**GRADE 4/5 STUDENTS IN EACH ACCOUNTABILITY ELIGIBILITY CATEGORY**

| Accountability Eligibility Category | 1995 <sup>1</sup><br>Grade 4 |         | 1996 <sup>1</sup><br>Grade 4 |         | 1997<br>Grade 4 |         | Grade 5 |         | 1998<br>Grade 4 |         | Grade 5 |         |
|-------------------------------------|------------------------------|---------|------------------------------|---------|-----------------|---------|---------|---------|-----------------|---------|---------|---------|
|                                     | Number                       | Percent | Number                       | Percent | Number          | Percent | Number  | Percent | Number          | Percent | Number  | Percent |
|                                     |                              |         |                              |         |                 |         |         |         |                 |         |         |         |
| Exempted: Language                  | 72                           | 0.0     | 71                           | 0.1     | 109             | 0.2     | 98      | 0.2     | 121             | 0.3     | 118     | 0.2     |
| Exempted: Medical                   | 33                           | 0.1     | 52                           | 0.1     | 95              | 0.2     | 73      | 0.2     | 86              | 0.2     | 49      | 0.1     |
| Exempted: Foreign Exchange          | 3                            | 0.1     | 2                            | 0.0     | 1               | 0.0     | 2       | 0.0     | 3               | 0.0     | 0       | 0.0     |
| Exempted: Alternate Portfolio       |                              |         | 31                           | 0.1     | 30              | 0.1     | 0       | 0.0     | 43              | 0.1     |         |         |
| Exempted: Moved                     | 364                          | 0.7     | 290                          | 0.6     | 38              | 0.1     | 24      | 0.1     | 41              | 0.1     | 46      | 0.1     |
| Exempted: Other                     | 14                           | 0.0     | 18                           | 0.0     | 581             | 1.2     | 87      | 0.2     | 621             | 1.3     | 10      | 0.0     |
| Exempted: Total                     | 486                          | 1.0     | 464                          | 1.0     | 854             | 1.8     | 284     | 0.6     | 915             | 1.9     | 223     | 0.5     |
| Eligible: Non-Performing            | 3                            | 0.0     | 33                           | 0.1     | 43              | 0.1     | 63      | 0.1     | 44              | 0.1     | 91      | 0.2     |
| Eligible: Alternate Portfolio       | 327                          | 0.7     | 293                          | 0.6     | 313             | 0.6     | 188     | 0.4     | 341             | 0.7     | 222     | 0.5     |
| Eligible: Tested                    | 49,310                       | 98.4    | 47,725                       | 98.4    | 47,289          | 97.5    | 47,279  | 98.9    | 46,410          | 97.3    | 47,045  | 98.9    |
| Eligible: Total                     | 49,640                       | 99.0    | 48,051                       | 99.0    | 47,646          | 98.2    | 47,530  | 99.4    | 46,795          | 98.1    | 47,358  | 99.5    |
| Total                               | 50,126                       | 100.0   | 48,515                       | 100.0   | 48,500          | 100.0   | 47,814  | 100.0   | 47,710          | 100.0   | 47,581  | 100.0   |

<sup>1</sup>Numbers for 1995 and 1996 may differ from *Cycle 2 Technical Manual* because of redefinition of the categories, and a more detailed cross tabulation. A new category for students who moved out of state was created.

**TABLE 7-3**  
**GRADE7/ 8 STUDENTS IN EACH ACCOUNTABILITY ELIGIBILITY CATEGORY**

| Accountability Eligibility Category | 1995 <sup>2</sup><br>Grade 8 |         | 1996 <sup>2</sup><br>Grade 8 |         | 1997<br>Grade 7 |         | Grade 8 |         | 1998<br>Grade 7 |         | Grade 8 |         |
|-------------------------------------|------------------------------|---------|------------------------------|---------|-----------------|---------|---------|---------|-----------------|---------|---------|---------|
|                                     | Number                       | Percent | Number                       | Percent | Number          | Percent | Number  | Percent | Number          | Percent | Number  | Percent |
| Exempted: Language                  |                              |         | 65                           | 0.1     | 108             | 0.2     | 67      | 0.1     | 136             | 0.3     | 102     | 0.2     |
| Exempted: Medical                   | 69                           | 0.1     | 89                           | 0.2     | 123             | 0.2     | 126     | 0.3     | 123             | 0.2     | 171     | 0.3     |
| Exempted: Foreign Exchange          | 48                           | 0.1     | 2                            | 0.0     | 2               | 0.0     | 22      | 0.0     | 3               | 0.0     | 0       | 0.0     |
| Exempted: From Alter. Portfolio     |                              |         | 66                           | 0.1     |                 |         | 86      | 0.2     |                 |         | 144     | 0.3     |
| Exempted: Moved                     | 431                          | 0.8     | 365                          | 0.7     | 37              | 0.1     | 34      | 0.1     | 62              | 0.1     | 50      | 0.1     |
| Exempted: Other                     | 20                           | 0.0     | 29                           | 0.1     | 556             | 1.1     | 26      | 0.1     | 622             | 1.2     | 36      | 0.1     |
| Exempted: Total                     | 568                          | 1.1     | 616                          | 1.2     | 826             | 1.6     | 361     | 0.7     | 946             | 1.9     | 503     | 1.0     |
| Eligible: Non-Performing            | 0                            | 0.0     | 38                           | 0.1     | 176             | 0.3     | 249     | 0.5     | 185             | 0.4     | 344     | 0.7     |
| Eligible: Alternate Portfolio       | 319                          | 0.6     | 336                          | 0.7     | 146             | 0.3     | 385     | 0.8     | 217             | 0.4     | 345     | 0.7     |
| Eligible: Tested                    | 51,045                       | 98.3    | 50,686                       | 98.1    | 49,717          | 97.7    | 49,710  | 98.0    | 49,082          | 97.3    | 48,452  | 97.6    |
| Eligible: Total                     | 51,364                       | 98.9    | 51,060                       | 98.8    | 50,039          | 98.4    | 50,344  | 99.3    | 49,484          | 98.1    | 49,141  | 99.0    |
| Total                               | 51,932                       | 100.0   | 51,676                       | 100.0   | 50,865          | 100.0   | 50,705  | 100.0   | 50,430          | 100.0   | 49,644  | 100.0   |

<sup>1</sup> Following 1996 the definition of non-performing changed.

<sup>2</sup> Numbers for 1995 and 1996 may differ from *Cycle 2 Technical Manual* because of redefinition of the categories, and a more detailed cross tabulation. A new category for students who moved out of state was created.

**TABLE 7-4**  
**GRADE 11/12 STUDENTS IN EACH ACCOUNTABILITY ELIGIBILITY CATEGORY**

| Accountability Eligibility Category     | 1995 <sup>1</sup> |         |          |         | 1996 <sup>1</sup> |         |          |         | 1997     |         |          |         | 1998     |         |          |         |
|---|-------------------|---------|----------|---------|-------------------|---------|----------|---------|----------|---------|----------|---------|----------|---------|----------|---------|
|   | Grade 11          |         | Grade 12 |         | Grade 11          |         | Grade 12 |         | Grade 11 |         | Grade 12 |         | Grade 11 |         | Grade 12 |         |
|   | Number            | Percent | Number   | Percent | Number            | Percent | Number   | Percent | Number   | Percent | Number   | Percent | Number   | Percent | Number   | Percent |
| Exempted: Language                      | 26                | 0.1     | 15       | 0.0     | 42                | 0.1     | 27       | 0.1     | 45       | 0.1     | 26       | 0.1     | 50       | 0.1     | 29       | 0.1     |
| Exempted: Medical                       | 41                | 0.1     | 7        | 0.0     | 108               | 0.3     | 13       | 0.0     | 83       | 0.2     | 12       | 0.0     | 116      | 0.3     | 14       | 0.0     |
| Exempted: Foreign Exchange              | 76                | 0.2     | 176      | 0.5     | 124               | 0.3     | 167      | 0.4     | 127      | 0.3     | 177      | 0.5     | 122      | 0.3     | 207      | 0.5     |
| Exempted: Alter. Port.                  |                   |         |          |         |                   |         | 23       | 0.1     |          |         | 16       | 0.0     |          |         | 35       | 0.1     |
| Exempted: Moved                         | 38                | 0.1     | 120      | 0.3     | 17                | 0.0     | 110      | 0.3     | 19       | 0.0     |          |         | 10       | 0.0     |          |         |
| Exempted: Other                         | 112               | 0.3     | 381      | 1.0     | 118               | 0.3     | 371      | 0.9     | 15       | 0.0     | 129      | 0.3     | 34       | 0.1     | 65       | 0.2     |
| Exempted: Total                         | 293               | 0.7     | 699      | 1.8     | 409               | 1.0     | 711      | 1.8     | 289      | 0.7     | 360      | 0.9     | 332      | 0.8     | 350      | 0.9     |
| Eligible: Non - Performing <sup>2</sup> | 0                 | 0.0     | 258      | 0.0     | 0                 | 0.0     | 350      | 1.2     | 270      | 0.6     | 234      | 0.7     | 350      | 0.9     | 244      | 0.6     |
| Eligible: Alternate Portfolio           | 105               | 0.2     | 209      | 0.5     | 161               | 0.4     | 149      | 0.4     | 179      | 0.4     | 258      | 0.7     | 195      | 0.5     | 268      | 0.7     |
| Eligible: Tested                        | 41,697            | 99.1    | 37,682   | 98.5    | 41,354            | 98.6    | 37,333   | 96.6    | 40,911   | 98.2    | 37,888   | 97.8    | 40,297   | 97.9    | 38,574   | 97.8    |
| Eligible: Total                         | 41,802            | 99.3    | 38,149   | 99.0    | 41,515            | 99.0    | 37,832   | 98.2    | 41,360   | 99.3    | 38,380   | 99.1    | 40,842   | 99.2    | 39,086   | 99.1    |
| Total                                   | 42,095            | 100.0   | 38,848   | 100.0   | 41,924            | 100.0   | 38,543   | 100.0   | 41,649   | 100.0   | 38,740   | 100.0   | 41,174   | 100.0   | 39,436   | 100.0   |

<sup>1</sup>Numbers for 1995 and 1996 may differ from *Cycle 2 Technical Manual* because of redefinition of the categories, and a more detailed cross tabulation. A new category for students who moved out of state was created.

<sup>2</sup>Following 1996 the definition of non-performing changed. The Grade 12 figure for 1996 was due to non-submitted portfolios.

## ADMINISTRATION OF OPEN-RESPONSE TESTS

**GENERAL PROCEDURES.** Table 7-5 presents the test dates for each year of the third accountability cycle. As an example, for the 1995-96 school year, testing of all grade 11 students in Kentucky public schools occurred between February 12 and March 1, 1996. Testing for grades 4 and 8 took place April 15 through May 3. After 1996 the performance events were not administered, and they were not included in the school

| <b>TABLE 7-5<br/>TESTING WINDOWS<sup>1</sup></b> |                               |                        |                       |                  |                   |
|--|-------------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|------------------|-------------------|
| Grade  | Test Type                     | Baseline Years         |                       | Growth Years     |                   |
|  |                               | 1994-95                | 1995-96               | 1996-97          | 1997-98           |
| 3  | National Norm Referenced Test |                        |                       | April 14 – May 2 | April 22 – May 12 |
| 4<br>1995-96<br>4/5<br>1997-98                   | On-Demand                     | April 17 – 28          | April 15 - May 3      | April 14 – May 2 | April 22 – May 12 |
|  | Performance Events            | April 16 - 28          | April 22 - May 10     |                  |                   |
| 6  | National Norm Referenced Test |                        |                       | April 14 – May 2 | April 22 – May 12 |
| 8<br>1995-96<br>7/8<br>1997-98                   | On-Demand                     | April 17 - 28          | April 15 - May 3      | April 14 – May 2 | April 22 – May 12 |
|  | Performance Events            | April 27 - May 12      | February 12 – March 1 |                  |                   |
| 9  | National Norm Referenced Test |                        |                       | April 14 – May 2 | April 22 – May 12 |
| 11/12  | On-Demand                     | February 6 - 20        | February 12 – March 1 | April 14 – May 2 | April 22 – May 12 |
|  | Performance Events            | February 27 - March 10 | March 8 – 29          |                  |                   |

<sup>1</sup> Not including make-up testing. Shading indicates test not administered.



accountability index in Accountability Cycle 3. The national norm referenced test was not administered before 1996, and it was not included in the school accountability index during Accountability Cycle 3.

Within these testing windows, schools were allowed to set up their own specific testing schedules. Coordinators' and administrators' manuals served as a guide to administration. The manuals detailed timing requirements, directions for students, and other considerations for administering the tests and handling materials. A section entitled "Appropriate Assessment Practices" was included in the test administration manual. This document outlined appropriate behaviors for school personnel during testing, and included an affirmation for the teacher to sign indicating compliance. A copy of this document is available in the Kentucky Department of Education's 1997-1998 District Assessment Coordinator Implementation Guide, Appendix I).

Seven subject areas were assessed using open response tests: Reading, Mathematics, Science, Social Studies, Arts and Humanities, Practical Living/Vocational Studies, and On-Demand Writing. Until the 1996 test each subject was administered in one test session for one and a half hours. Test administration procedures prior to and including 1996 provided students with as much additional time as needed as long as constructive progress was being made toward completion of the test. Additional time was scheduled directly after the initial test session for the subject area. Beginning with the 1997 assessment content area tests were divided into three sections (A, B, C) for Reading, Mathematics, Science, and Social Studies. The Arts & Humanities test was Section A and the Practical Living/Vocational Studies test was Section B of a combined test. The sections within a given testing session were to be from the same content area. Extended time could only be at the immediate end of a testing session. Students received a test booklet and a separate scannable answer document in which they recorded their answers to all questions, including open-response questions. Twelve forms of the test were created; students were randomly given one form that they used for all sections of the test. In other words, if they received Form 1 for the reading test, they completed Form 1 for other subject areas as well.

Each school principal completed a Principal's Certification of Proper Test Administration form to confirm enrollment and testing figures. An example is included as Appendix B. The principal also certified on this form that the testing was conducted in accordance with the instructions provided in the manuals and that all materials were handled in a secure manner.

**SHIPPING AND RECEIVING PROCEDURES.** All materials for a specific school were packaged by the contractor and shipped to District Assessment Coordinators. The materials were sent to district offices approximately one week prior to the beginning of test administration. All district and school personnel were informed that the materials were secure and that all materials had to be returned to the testing contractor upon completion of testing. District Assessment Coordinators were instructed to package all materials from all schools in their districts within one week after the completion of testing. The shipping company picked up packaged materials from every district office.

## **Chapter 7**

### **Test Administration**

The testing contractor received packages of answer sheets, which were collected in a prescribed location for check-in. Packages were opened one at a time, answer sheets were counted, and the count was compared with information provided by the school principal on the Principal's Certification of Proper Test Administration form. The count was entered in a log, and any discrepancies were noted both on the log and on the principal's form. Resolution of discrepancies was first sought through the District Assessment Coordinator. If the discrepancy could not be resolved at the local level, KDE ultimately resolved it, which could result in the assignment of Novice to one or more students.

Test booklets and other material were checked for stray answer documents or other forms mistakenly shipped with them. The test booklet barcodes were scanned and verified to determine that all materials were returned. The booklets were treated as secure materials.

To prepare the answer sheets for hand scoring, the cover page was separated from the open-response pages. Cover pages were scanned and the open-response pages left in the booklets were separated by form and shuffled to ensure that multiple scorers would evaluate open-responses from each school.

## **ADMINISTRATION OF PERFORMANCE EVENTS**

Performance events were deleted from the accountability index and were not administered subsequent to 1996. No description of them is included in this report, but may be found in the *KIRIS Accountability Cycle 2 Technical Manual*.

## **ADMINISTRATION OF NATIONAL NORM REFERENCED TEST**

The state required norm referenced test is the *CTBS/5 TerraNova Survey Edition (CTBS/5)*, which tests Reading/Language Arts and Mathematics. The appropriate level of this test is administered at the end of primary (normally grade 3) and at the end of grades 6 and 9. The item format is multiple-choice and takes approximately two hours to administer. The administration occurs during the same testing window as the Kentucky Core Content Test. CTB/McGraw-Hill provides examination materials, scores, and reports results for the national norm referenced assessment. Score reports arrive in the districts no more than 45 days after CTB/McGraw-Hill receives the answer sheets. The CTBS/5 results provide a useful profile of students' academic strengths and weaknesses as well as traditional comparisons with national norms.

| <b>Table 7-6</b><br><b>NATIONAL NORM REFERENCED ASSESSMENT</b><br><b>CTBS/5 Survey Edition</b> |  |                        |                        |
|--|--|------------------------|------------------------|
| Content Area   | Number of Multiple-Choice Items<br>Testing Time Required |                        |                        |
|  | Level 13<br>End of Primary                               | Level 16<br>Grade 6    | Level 19<br>Grade 9    |
| Reading/<br>Language Arts  | 50 items<br>65 minutes                                   | 55 items<br>70 minutes | 55 items<br>70 minutes |
| Mathematics  | 30 items<br>40 minutes                                   | 30 items<br>40 minutes | 25 items<br>40 minutes |

## ADMINISTRATION OF PORTFOLIOS

**WRITING PORTFOLIOS.** KIRIS Writing Portfolios were administered in the third accountability cycle following the model established in 1992. A detailed description of the structure and process of training for development and scoring portfolios can be found in *The Kentucky Writing Portfolio, Teacher's Handbook, 1997-1998*. This handbook came in three versions, one each for grades 4, 7, and 12

**TEACHER TRAINING AND MATERIALS.** So that all teachers had access to the same information and materials, sets of all replacement pages for the *Kentucky Writing Portfolio, Teacher's Handbook* were sent to DACs for dissemination to the district schools in September of each school year. The materials included a current writing calendar, a revised list of regional resource teachers and coordinators, the revised table of contents, information about changes and critical issues, glossary additions, video resources, and other portfolio topics.

School districts photocopied and disseminated training materials to as many teachers as they chose to train for that year. This process provided access to new materials for all teachers involved in the development and scoring of portfolios. The *Kentucky Writing Portfolio, Teacher's Handbook* and grade specific scoring materials were revised in 1995 to simplify and make accessible all previous revisions. The 1998 replacement pages brought that document up to date for all teachers involved with the writing portfolios. Teachers also received any changes to the *Kentucky Writing Portfolio Holistic Scoring Guide* each year. KDE and Kentucky Educational Television presented live telecasts in 1997 and 1998. These were to be recorded at the local level and used to assist in training teachers. Editions of a video entitled *Getting Started with the Writing Portfolio* were also produced in both 1997 and 1998.

**DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION.** The first phase of training addressed the development of portfolios, fulfillment of requirements, and state guidelines for the generation of student work. Students spend the school year developing their portfolio, under the guidance of their teacher in accordance with *Guidelines for the Generation of Student Work*, (in *Kentucky Writing Portfolio Teacher's Handbook*, Kentucky

Department of Education) as an integral part of their classroom instruction. Students and teachers may use the Self Assessment/Conference form to evaluate and prepare revisions of their work. Conferencing is an essential step to develop excellent portfolio entries. Following analysis, the student decides about further revisions and inclusion of specific entries in the portfolio. Cluster leaders, regional coordinators, KDE and testing contractor staff were available to assist teachers when needed throughout the year.

**TRAINING FOR SCORING.** Teachers were trained on the standards and procedures for scoring writing portfolios. This was accomplished through the same training procedures as for development and implementation. The following materials were used during this second phase of writing portfolio training:

*The Kentucky Writing Portfolio Teacher Handbook*  
*The Kentucky Writing Portfolio Holistic Scoring Guide*  
*The Kentucky Writing Portfolio Scoring Training Manual*

**WRITING PORTFOLIO AUDITS.** During the summer of 1996 the Department of Education conducted an audit of the writing portfolios at grades 4, 8, and 12. Approximately 100 schools were selected (half randomly and half purposefully) and the portfolios re-scored. The audit provided information concerning the accuracy of local teacher scoring of portfolios. Results were made available to the schools in mid-September. Writing indices, and consequently, school accountability indices were adjusted to reflect the results of re-scoring. After the completion of the audit meetings, the statewide testing results were released. Audits continued during 1997 and 1998, but only for grades 4 and 12. With the move to grade 7 from grade 8, the middle school Writing Portfolio entered a two year research and development phase for 1997 and 1998 with no audits. See Chapter 12 for results of the audits.

**MATHEMATICS PORTFOLIOS.** In 1993, Mathematics Portfolios were added to the KIRIS assessment in the accountability grades. The entire Mathematics Portfolio process followed the structure and procedures established for Writing Portfolios. There were no major changes over the course of the second accountability cycle from the Mathematics Portfolio process implemented in 1993. The final two years of Cycle 2 are the baseline years for Cycle 3, so changes made for 1997 came midway through Cycle 3. The major change was the placing of Mathematics Portfolios in research and development.

Legislation passed by the General Assembly in the 1996 session (HB 379) stipulated that the Mathematics Portfolio not be used in baseline calculations for 1997 and 1998. The Kentucky Mathematics Assessment Program entered a two year research and development phase to “make changes to improve the implementation and scoring of the mathematics portfolio that promote quality mathematics instruction and decrease the amount of teacher and student time necessary to fulfill the requirements” (HB 379). The intention was to reintroduce the portfolios for the purpose of accountability in 1999. The Department in conjunction with the Mathematics Portfolio Advisory Committee (MPAC, a group specified in the legislation) conducted field studies designed to streamline the development and scoring of portfolios in 75 selected classrooms. MPAC collected and

examined student work and consulted with technical experts on psychometric issues. MPAC approved a new scoring guide and scoring model, and revised portfolio content requirements. MPAC also differentiated the Mathematics Portfolio from the Writing Portfolio, and provided sample tasks for classroom use. Appendix C contains documents summarizing these changes. Appendix D contains summary tables of statistics demonstrating the quality of the new scoring rubric compared to three alternatives that were considered. Appendix E contains the results of an item response theory Rasch model program (*FACETS*) applied to the portfolio research. Nearly 200 classrooms participated in a spring 1997 field test. During 1998, teachers from across the state were invited to practice the new format and scoring rubric, which had been designed to be analytic rather than holistic. Following the completion of the research and development phase, a recommendation for a four-year period of implementation and expansion of quality practices was put forward. This phase was to include benchmarking to link the portfolio to state performance standards and validation studies to evaluate the impact of portfolios on teaching and learning. The Kentucky State Board of Education accepted the voluntary implementation of the portfolio over four years and requested a specific implementation plan. Since the Mathematics Portfolio was no longer required and was deleted from the accountability index, the number of schools and districts implementing the portfolio was minimal. In the implementation plan the Cluster Leaders provided information about best practices, curriculum alignment, and professional development. Additionally, Cluster Leaders were designated as the point of contact for information about portfolios and the new scoring rubric.

**ALTERNATE PORTFOLIO.** Alternate Portfolio administration followed a process similar to the Writing Portfolio, including training for development and implementation. Alternate Portfolios differ dramatically from the Writing Portfolio with respect to determining student eligibility and portfolio scoring.

The alternate portfolio program is for students with disabilities who meet the criteria for eligibility specified in the Program Advisory OCAA-93-104 which appears as Appendix F in the *1998 District Assessment Coordinator's Implementation Guide* (September, 1997). This is a small population of students whose programs in school are significantly different from those of other students. These programs are tailored to the Individual Education Program (IEP). Instead of participating in On-Demand Writing and the Writing Portfolio assessment, these students submit an Alternate Portfolio for inclusion in a school's accountability index at grades 4 and 8, and in their last anticipated year of school.

Only teachers trained to score Alternate Portfolios evaluated them. In February and March of each year scorer training took place. At the actual regional scoring sessions, teachers were provided with an Alternate Portfolio score form on which they placed a lithocode number from the grade appropriate student response booklet/writing portfolio score form. The lithocode number identified the student and their portfolio status throughout the scoring process.

Beginning in 1998 all scoring took place at the regional or state level. Teachers with students producing an Alternate Portfolio brought their own portfolios to the regional

scoring session. The Alternate Portfolio was scored at the regional level by two different teams of two trained teachers from other districts. If the scores assigned to a portfolio at the regional scoring session differed in performance levels, or was distinguished, the portfolio was sent to the state level scoring session. Prior to 1998, portfolios were sent to the state if the district score differed from a single scoring at the regional level by two or more points on a four-point scale, or if a proficient or distinguished district score did not hold at the regional level. A committee composed of regional leaders, support network leaders, and project staff scored these discrepant portfolios. In these cases, the third score was used as the accountability score. The state scorers also scored a random sample of Alternate Portfolios to assure reliability in regional scoring. Portfolios selected for reliability checking were not subject to scoring change. A further sample of portfolios at each performance level was selected for a validity check. Validity checks ensured that the portfolio system accurately gauged the level of performance for students in the alternate portfolio system. The validity checks could entail a site visit to the student's educational program and interviews with the student, teacher(s), and family member or caregiver.

Documents used in the development of portfolio scoring training were annual editions of the following:

*KIRIS Alternate Portfolio Teachers Guide*  
*KIRIS Alternate Portfolio Addendum*  
*KIRIS Alternate Portfolio Scoring Manual*

## ASSESSMENT OF NONCOGNITIVE INDICATORS

In addition to the cognitive indicators used to measure school success, KERA mandates that noncognitive indicators be factored into the accountability index. A subcontractor for the assessment, WestEd, collected and analyzed the noncognitive data until the 1997. Beginning with 1998 the data collection was transferred to the Office of Budget and Financial Management, Division of School Finance, Attendance and Data Collection Branch. Each year a booklet of the guidelines was published. The last one for Cycle 3 was *Guidelines for Noncognitive Data Submittables for the 1997-98 School Year*. The noncognitive indicators represented sixteen percent of the overall school accountability index in the third accountability cycle, and were composed of several indicators, not all of which were used at each grade level. A brief description of the noncognitive indicators follows:

- **Attendance Rate**, defined as the ratio of aggregate attendance to the sum of aggregate attendance and aggregate absence (used at all grade levels);
- **Retention Rate**, defined as the ratio of number retained to total year end membership (used at grades 4 to 12);
- **Dropout Rate**, defined as the ratio of number of dropouts to total year end membership added to the number of dropouts (used at grades 7 to 12 only); and

- **Successful Transition Rate**, defined as the ratio of number of “successful” high school graduates to the total number of graduates. As detailed in the 1997 revision of the *Noncognitive Guidelines* (see Appendix E of the 1997-98 *DAC Implementation Guide*), “successful transition to adult life” is identified by such criteria as full-time enrollment in post-secondary school, employment in a non-temporary position at least 30 hours per week, active military status, or a combination of these situations totaling at least 30 hours per week. Transition is assessed by school administrators, who must verify “successful” transition with either the student or a member of the student’s family (used in grade 12 only).

**LAGGING DATA TO ACCOMMODATE TIMELY REPORTING OF SCORES.** To facilitate reporting accountability index scores to schools in October of the year following test administration, it was necessary, beginning with 1995 test results, to lag the noncognitive data by one year. That is, the school accountability index for 1995 test scores was calculated using noncognitive indicators based on 1994 attendance, dropout, retention and successful transition rate figures. Scores for 1995 and 1996 were lagged in this regard because successful transition rate data from a given year were not available by the mid-September deadline necessary for inclusion in scores reported in October, whereas other non-cognitive indicators were available only in preliminary form, if at all. Thus, in the second accountability cycle, 1993 noncognitive data were used for 1993 accountability indices, 1994 noncognitive data were used for the 1994 and 1995 accountability indices, and 1995 noncognitive data were used for the 1996 accountability indices. The pattern of using prior year data for the noncognitive indicators continued throughout Cycle 3. As a result 1997 data was used for the accountability index in 1998.

**ACCURACY OF NONCOGNITIVE DATA.** Noncognitive data from 1992 and 1993 were examined in a study of the accuracy of the noncognitive indicators and the procedures used to collect the data. (A full discussion of reliability issues for KIRIS noncognitive indicators can be found in Appendix F of the *1992-93 KIRIS Technical Report*.) In general, the analyses focused on:

- The thoroughness of the data collection procedures including check-in and auditing strategies;
- Stability within years, as indicated by modifications of submitted data following review by school and district staff of their original submissions;
- Stability across years, as indicated by comparisons of 1993 data to previous year’s data; and,
- Interpretability of the data across indicators at various grade and statewide levels.

These analyses found the procedures used to collect and report KERA noncognitive indicators to be thorough and reliable. It was suggested that KDE expand the number

## **Chapter 7**

### **Test Administration**

of options for districts to submit data, emphasizing methods that take advantage of improving local technology capabilities, and at the same time standardize noncognitive data-collection procedures and timelines and eliminate duplication of effort. In addition, findings suggested that KDE should increase the training of local staff on the modified definition of dropouts through memoranda, meetings, and other techniques, as well as consider a pilot study examining the accuracy of local data-collection procedures across the indicators. During the period from 1992 through 1997 the improvements in procedure took place through changes in the *Guidelines*. When the transition was made to KDE collecting the data in 1998, schools submitted the data on diskettes in a standard format.